

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-230 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Conrad et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,028,605.

As the Examiner is aware, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) requires that the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim (See MPEP 2131). Applicant's inventive concept as recited in claim 1 resides in a method for delivering data to a user's computer. The method provides a menu of available data to be delivered from an automated delivery system. The menu includes predetermined specifications for delivering data. At least one of the predetermined specifications allows the user to specify at least one of the user computer database locations for the data to be delivered. The data identified by the user's selection to the user's computer is outputted based on the at least one set of predetermined data delivery specifications.

Conrad et al. teach categorizing different types of information through the use of semantic properties by using a graphical user interface. Conrad et al. teach methods for querying a database and also methods for displaying the results of the query on a user's screen. Conrad et al. does not teach or suggest specifying a specific database location on the user's computer to deliver data or delivering the data identified by a user's selection to the user's computer based on the at least one set of predetermined data delivery specifications. Applicant's inventive concept, as recited in claim 1, allows a user to specify the user computer database

location for delivering the data and delivers the data to the specified database location.

Thus, Conrad et al. does not teach or suggest a method of repeatedly delivering data to a user's computer, as recited in Applicant's claim 1, and thus each of the claims that depend therefrom. For this reason alone, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-230 are not anticipated by the Conrad et al. reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-230 are not anticipated by the Conrad et al. reference. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-230 is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection of Claim Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed January 29, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrad et al. in view of Louis A. Ollivier (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,958).

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully traversed on the basis that the prior art reference of Conrad et al. does not teach, disclose, or even suggest Applicant's method of repeatedly delivering data to a user's computer as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1.

Applicant's inventive concept as recited in claim 1 resides in a method for delivering data to a user's computer. The method provides a menu of available

data to be delivered from an automated delivery system. The menu includes predetermined specifications for delivering data. At least one of the predetermined specifications allows the user to specify at least one of the user computer database locations for the data to be delivered. The data identified by the user's selection to the user's computer is outputted based on the at least one set of predetermined data delivery specifications.

Conrad et al. teach categorizing different types of information through the use of semantic properties by using a graphical user interface. Conrad et al. teach methods for querying a database and also methods for displaying the results of the query on a user's screen. Conrad et al. does not teach or suggest specifying a specific database location on the user's computer to deliver data or delivering the data identified by a user's selection to the user's computer based on the at least one set of predetermined data delivery specifications. Applicant's inventive concept, as recited in claim 1, allows a user to specify the user computer database location for delivering the data and delivers the data to the specified database location.

The Examiner has recognized that the Conrad et al. reference does not disclose a verification program each time data is delivered and has attempted to supply the deficiency with the verification program of Ollivier. However, it is respectfully submitted that Ollivier does not supply the deficiency of Conrad et al. Ollivier teaches a method for controlling the batchwise delivery of process gas for semiconductor manufacturing using a flow control

system. The flow control system is used to provide a flow setting, read the actual value of the flow delivered, start and stop a delivery phase and select flow verification at each delivery or periodically. However, there is no teaching in Ollivier of allowing a user to specify at least one of the user computer database locations for the data to be delivered or delivering the data to the specified location.

As the Examiner is aware, the prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention. Providing the system of categorizing data in Conrad et al. with the verification system of Ollivier would not provide one with the capability of specifying at least one of the user computer database locations for the data to be delivered as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that dependent claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 23 are not obvious over Conrad et al. in view of Ollivier within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 24, 47, 70, 93, 116, 139, 162, 185, and 208 are not anticipated by Conrad et al. within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and are not obvious over Conrad et al. in view of Ollivier within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 24, 47, 70, 93, 116, 139, 162, 185, 208 and thus each of the claims which depend therefrom.

### Other References

Patents to Virine et al., Barrus et al., Kovacs, Knight et al., and Knight, cited as pertinent art, have been reviewed and considered. It is believed that such patents do not teach Applicant's invention of a method for repeatedly delivering data to a user's computer as recited in independent claims 1, 24, 47, 70, 93, 116, 139, 162, 185, and 207, and thus the claims that depend therefrom.

### SUMMARY

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are now in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this amendment, Applicant's attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss the same with the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc A. Brockhaus, Reg. No. 40,923  
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.  
1601 NW Expressway, Suite 1000  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118  
(405) 607-8600  
Attorney for Applicant